



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of the league the traditional national policy of the United States known as the 'Monroe Doctrine,' as it has been from time to time asserted and whereby for its own defense this Nation has regarded as an unfriendly act any attempt by foreign nations, whether by war or purchase or diplomatic intrigue, to make territorial acquisitions or to secure new strategical footholds upon or near the Western Hemisphere, or to secure political advantage in the domestic affairs of American nations; or

"(b) As affecting or bringing under the jurisdiction of the league such domestic matters as the admission of immigrants to this country, the regulation of commerce, including coastwise trade and transportation, or the fiscal policy, including tariff laws."

Following Mr. Taft's suggestions the editor of the *Herald* himself adds:

"If to the reservations above outlined there be added one further clause, making it clear that America will always construe the right of withdrawal on two years' notice as being an affirmative right which cannot be vitiated by any league strictures, based upon alleged misconduct during those 'two years' through which the 'notice' must run, we believe a solid, substantial, patriotic, safe, sane course has been charted which will readily command a heavy Senate majority and which will be entitled to the whole-hearted indorsement of the people of the United States.

"Advocates of the league insist (and will continue to insist) that the league covenant is 'safe for the United States,' because, say they, it does mean just what these reservations say it means. How, then, can they hope to successfully argue against permitting the Senate to say so officially, concurrent with its act of ratification? Evidently Mr. Taft does not intend to be in that dubious posture.

"It would be suicidal negligence to ratify the covenant without making these moot points clear, without protecting ourselves while we are yet free agents in the world. On the other hand, with these reservations declared, it would be rank provincialism not to participate in the league experiment for the sake of the great peace good it may be made to accomplish within its legitimate sphere.

"And who, pray, will object?

"Britain cannot complain if we are at least partially as jealous of our rights as she has been of hers. She signed no covenant until her supremacy of the seas had been saved for all time and until her league influence had been beautifully safeguarded. Japan cannot complain. She got Shantung, answering her particular national ideal, before she yielded to the call of the dotted line. France can not complain. She obtained, with Mr. Wilson's consent, the greatest 'reservation' of all when she negotiated a supplementary alliance under which we are called upon to refight her battles along the German Rhine in case the league does not function satisfactorily. As a matter of fact, no foreign nation can object (1) because the Old World can not have a league without us, and it wants us at any price to help carry its load; (2) because to 'object' to such reservations as these would be to openly confess that there is a foreign intention ultimately to interpret the league against us and our independence and our autonomy.

"If no one can object outside the United States, why, in Heaven's name, should any one inside the United States, from President Wilson down, object, when the sole and only purpose is to preserve America and make clear to the world that we are not abrogating any of our intentions to preserve America?"

We do not differ with our critics over the contractual nature of this treaty. We simply repeat, what persons

familiar with the history of treaties know, that treaties are frequently ratified with reservations and that without reopening negotiations. It is difficult to draw a line between reservations and amendments, a discussion of which would be academical merely. It is clear that the Covenant of the League of Nations cannot be ratified by the Senate without some modification. What we call the modification is irrelevant. The differences of interpretation of the treaty alone indicate beyond question the necessity for definite explanatory clauses, for we need to remember that the document when once proclaimed will be interpreted, not by what others now say it means, but by the language within the document itself. Therefore, ambiguity in any of its phrases must be overcome now. The reservations necessary for this purpose will necessarily change the meaning of the treaty for some. But the important thing is that they will make it clear. In a treaty of such fundamental importance that much is indispensable.

KEEP IT OUT OF POLITICS

IN his masterpiece, *Joan of Arc*, Mark Twain makes Louis Le Conte say that "Evidence is the bones of opinion." The friends and foes of the League of Nations are flooding us with boneless opinions. What the American people need is facts concerning the League of Nations. These facts cannot be the exclusive possession of a political party. The proposed League of Nations is a matter fundamentally affecting American policies and should be accepted or rejected upon its merits.

Both friends and foes of the League are injuring their respective sides with emotional, irrational, and inaccurate utterances.

The editor of a leading American magazine friendly to the League, attempting to answer the question, "What is this Treaty of Peace," contradicts himself by saying that the treaty "has created a council of nine with adequate powers to supervise the international realm and all matters 'within the sphere of action of the League,'" and then that it has not "limited the sovereignty of nations." He tells us that "for the first time in history sanctions are provided for carrying out of the court's decrees," but he does not tell us what those sanctions are. He does not care to confess that this proposed covenant contemplates a League to Enforce Peace against the United States. He makes the statement that, "It has recognized the Monroe Doctrine as the law of the League," ignoring article 21, which says that nothing in this Covenant shall be "deemed to affect the validity of international engagements such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like

the Monroe Doctrine." He says that it has abolished wars of conquest against weak and backward peoples, whose welfare shall hereafter be a "sacred trust of civilization," but he fails to show how this applies to Shantung. He tells us that "it has not put the United States where it can be coerced by an adverse majority, for all action is by common consent," a statement which overlooks the fact that if the United States be a party to a dispute it has no voice in the decision of the council, and that therefore it may "be coerced by an adverse majority." He says that the treaty does not affect the "constitutional right of Congress to declare war," a statement which is contradicted by our promise to "agree to this Covenant of the League of Nations" which will assume the right to decide when we shall or shall not go forth "to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League." These statements are typical of the indiscriminating propaganda spread before the American people by the League to Enforce Peace and other agencies more enthusiastically partisan than enlightening.

The unthinking will-to-win in this controversy is not confined to the friends of the League. The Republican Publicity Association, with headquarters in the Continental Trust Building, Washington, D. C., has recently issued a pamphlet entitled, "Americanism with Peace or Internationalism with War?" This pamphlet presents the thesis that the "League of Nations means war, not peace." We are not overimpressed by some of their questions such as, "Is the United States likely to submit tamely when, perchance, those little Central American republics raise a question inimical to the welfare of our country, and proceed to outvote us five to one?" Suppose they do? The United States cannot afford to deny the principle that disputes may be submitted to outside parties for adjudication and that the judgment of such a body should be accepted. We have done just that thing too often for that. It sounds picayune to complain that the Secretary General of the League is an Englishman and that the seat of the League is to be 3,000 miles distant from our shores. The committee's criticism of article 12 is quite unjust. It says: "Suppose the dispute had been submitted to the council, then a period of nine months must elapse before a nation is permitted to vindicate its rights by force of arms. Meanwhile, it must stand idly by and witness perhaps the destruction of its civilization, the murder of its nationals," etc. The trouble here is that the committee fails to recognize that the League, being of universal application, would aim to prevent any such "destruction" before it could get under way. Its criti-

cism of Article 14, which article paves the way for an international court of justice, is strained and unwarranted. The judgments of courts have never led to wars. The committee, in its criticism of article 15, frankly stands for the indefensible principle that great States should have the privilege of interfering with the internal affairs of the small. We cannot agree with the committee that article 18 of the Covenant, by simply requiring the registration of all treaties, "transcends the treaty-making power of the Senate." In the criticism of article 22 the committee opposes the principle of mandatories, quite ignoring the fact that we have long functioned in that capacity in Cuba and other countries to our south.

Such statements do not help the case against the League of Nations. They harm it. The same thing is true of Senator Reed's outburst against the League, basing his argument on the fear of the domination of the League by the colored races. Senator Sherman's discovery that the League if set up would be dominated by the Catholics is an adventure in fairyland.

What the American people wish now is not friction, but light, not cheap politics, but exalted and intelligent statesmanship. The spinal cord is inadequate to the task of this treaty's interpretation. The demand is for brains.

"COMPROMISE AND BARTER"

READERS of this magazine familiar with the course which this Society follows must be aware that we have never advocated as our program for the peace of the world a League of Nations. We have stood rather for progressive adjustment under the Society of Nations which already exists, a union which has functioned from time to time in the Hague Conferences, in the establishment of a Universal Postal Union, indeed in resisting the onslaught in the great war. It has seemed to us easier, more logical, more promising to develop institutions already existing, tried and familiar, than to take up again the task of bringing a new Minerva out of a new head of a new Jove. That has always been difficult business.

We cannot now abrogate the faiths appearing on the second page of this magazine each month since the beginning of the war. Those principles cannot be abrogated. They are of the very essence of Anglo-Saxon civilization. They are imbedded there in our laws and political beliefs. They constitute the very structure of our business, our education, our religion, our social milieu. The League of Nations can neither abrogate nor alter them. They will alter the League of Nations.